

Xag 6-2 F. Lewis
x ag 3-1
1 ag 4



By TED LEWIS

Washington, July 14.—Sherman Adams had a breather today. The target of attack in Congress was John Foster Dulles, due to the gray new Mideast crisis in Iraq.

Seldom if ever has Dulles—favorite whipping boy until Adams displaced him last month—taken the lashing he was given in the Senate. The threat of total collapse of our plans to hold the Arab world on our side loosened blasts at alleged errors of omission or commission in our foreign policy.

It will be for historians in the future to gauge Dulles' responsibility. But even they will note that the present arch critics of his policies since 1953 conceded that he was a tough man in a political brawl. He is hard to pin down, refuses to lose his temper, won't indulge in name calling and therefore infuriates his opponents, who usually fold up in a frenzy of frustration.

As one Senator remarked, while Dulles was being taken apart on the Senate floor, "The champ is back anyway. Sherman Adams doesn't know how to take it like that old pro, John Foster."

The Secretary of State, to be sure, is in a position of tremendous responsibility. He is not, like Adams, caught in a jam over gifts from an influential friend in trouble with regulatory agencies. On the success or failure of the foreign policy determined by Dulles and the President depends, in the final analysis, the grave question of war or peace, not whether the Wool Labeling Act has been violated.

Dulles and Ike, facing a Democratic Congress, thus have had to shrug off many a slap in the face in the interest of policies they believe will prevent the cold war from shattering into a holocaust of bloodshed.

It is considered extremely unlikely, however, that Dulles, even had he been in Adams' shoes, would have used the same tactics as Ike's top aid. He probably would have ignored most of the House influence probing committee's cracks about gifts, favors, etc., without retorting that they were all lies and smears, as Adams did. Dulles likes a fight, but prefers to keep in on a courtroom level, where legalistic arguments carry the punch and the clinching oratory comes only when the opposition gets smug and overconfident.

This Will Be a Real Test of Dulles' Temper

Yet there are some who doubt that Dulles can keep his temper in the present mood of Congress. They think it will be a real test, regardless of the fact he has weathered many such snarling attacks for five years.

What hurt most was that some Republicans either joined the attack or sat silent while Democratic Senators upbraided Dulles over the Iraq "surprise."

Joining the Democrats, for example, was Sen. Ralph Flanders (R-Vt.), who charged Dulles' policies in the Middle East "have sown the wind and he is reaping the whirlwind."

Sen. Hubert Humphrey (D-Minn.) headed the Democratic onslaught and said the Dulles-Eisenhower Mideast policy is "outworn," and added a sly crack at Dulles' brother, Allen, Central Intelligence Agency chief. The U.S., said Humphrey, is "always caught by such surprises." Half a dozen other Democrats joined in with scathing criticism.

The outburst against Dulles had been brewing a long time. Sen. Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.) and other Democrats on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had charged last month that Dulles had twisted the intent of the Eisenhower Doctrine resolution as approved by Congress. They heatedly took issue with Dulles' interpretation of the doctrine as permitting U.S. military intervention.

Now They Discover a Flaw in the Resolution

Despite the fact the Senate did some rewriting of the doctrine before approving it, Dulles was under attack today for what now appears to be a flaw—namely, that the pro-Western government of Iraq no longer exists, so it cannot call on the U. S. under the doctrine for armed help to preserve its independence.

It was also pointed out that Dulles himself, testifying before the joint Ike doctrine hearings of the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees in early 1957, agreed that "we must be quite sure that we do have a request" from a country for aid.

Dulles then said this was vitally important, or else the United States could be accused of doing what Russia did—"saying that it was going in to help the government of Hungary. We all know there was no real independent government there, and that what it was helping was not the people or the nation of Hungary, but the Soviet Union's own ambitions."

The issue of what to do about Iraq—discussed at today's momentous meeting of Congressional leaders of both parties at the White House—is a touchy one. This becomes doubly clear when Dulles' remarks of 18 months ago are recalled.

Radford's Testimony of 1957 Is Recalled

Today was one for Congressional second-guessers to deliver their spels, although in a showdown they will support whatever decision the Administration makes, for the dimensions of the crisis are realized in both House and Senate.

As one hindsight Senator recalled, Adm. Arthur W. Radford, then chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, gave his views at the Senate hearings in February, 1957. Radford had all the intelligence estimates on the Arab world, from our ambassadors, the CIA, our allies and Pentagon secret agents.

Radford testified that there would be "a marked reaction" among the "uncommitted Arab countries" against the Russians "and the Syrians and the Egyptians if they persist in building up armed forces." The "marked reaction" would be of the kind to push the "uncommitted" countries to the side of the Western world. In 18 months the opposite appears to have happened.



John Foster Dulles
Back under the lash